



## Naval Air Station South Weymouth, MA Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes April 14, 2011

### 1. INTRODUCTIONS/ APPROVAL OF PRIOR MEETING MINUTES

John Goodrich, RAB facilitator, opened the meeting at approximately 7:00 PM. He requested that all attendees, including RAB members, regulators, and audience members, introduce themselves. He noted that the meeting agenda, handouts, and the sign-in sheet were available on the table by the door. The sign-in sheet for the meeting is provided as Attachment A. J. Goodrich asked if everyone had time to read the minutes from the February 2010 RAB meeting and if there were any comments. There were no comments.

He reviewed the guidelines for the meeting and reminded everyone that the focus of the meeting is cleanup issues. Any issues and/or comments not related to base cleanup will be noted and referred to the appropriate agency or organization. He reminded the participants when asking questions to wait to speak until they are acknowledged, to state their names and affiliations, and to speak clearly or into the microphone when they have questions.

He then reviewed the agenda for the meeting. The meeting agenda and the action item tracking list are provided as Attachment B. In accordance with the agenda, the presentation and discussion would be followed by the updates and action items portion of the meeting. The minutes, agenda and action items for the meeting are posted on the BRAC PMO website: <http://www.bracpmo.navy.mil/>.

### 2. PRESENTATION

J. Goodrich introduced Dave Barney to give the presentation on the Main Gate Encroachment Area (MGEA). D. Barney began the presentation by noting that the MGEA site is a small example of the clean up process, from discovery to site closeout. Slide 2 shows the objectives of the presentation. The MGEA is located at the main entrance to the facility, right along Route 18. The Navy acquired the property in the mid-1980's in order to change the entrance to the Base from White Street to Route 18. The Navy acquired 3 residential properties and built a new main gate with a security facility, etc.

The MGEA is 0.36 acres (Slide 3). There was no fence ever constructed around this small area. As a result, the next door businesses were able to access the Navy area and use it to store equipment and materials. When LNR was beginning construction of the Southfield entrance in 2007, it was brought to

the Navy's attention that the neighboring business had encroached onto Navy property. The Navy performed a site inspection and file review in May 2007. The equipment (trucks, roll-off containers, cement, mixer, etc.) and types of materials (brick, asphalt, sand, piping, etc.) that were on Navy land were documented. Based on the evidence of encroachment onto Navy property by the abutter, the Navy decided to perform an investigation and developed a site investigation work plan. Sediment, surface soil (0-1 ft), subsurface soil (1-3 ft), and groundwater (3 wells were installed) samples were collected to gather preliminary information. The samples were analyzed for VOCs, SVOCs, PAHs, EPH/VPH, pesticides, PCBs, metals, and cyanide.

Slide 4 shows the site features and the encroachment area. The site is bordered by wetlands and a stream on the east side and Route 18 on the west. AOC 53 is a closed site to the east of the MGEA and Calnan Road. Sample locations were staked in January 2008; samples were collected in March 2008. The investigation results are presented on Slide 5. Site soil, sediment, and groundwater were impacted by PAHs, with soil impacted to a limited extent by pesticides. The highest concentrations were found in samples located near the Navy/abutter property line. After reviewing the data and discussing the investigation results with the regulators, it was determined that a removal action was warranted. An engineering evaluation/cost analysis (EE/CA) which evaluated various removal alternatives was completed in January 2010 (Slide 6). Three alternatives were evaluated; excavation and off-site disposal was selected as the most cost-effective option that best satisfied the EE/CA evaluation criteria. The Navy provided a 30-day public comment period for review of the EE/CA and the proposed action was discussed at the January 14, 2010 RAB meeting. An Action Memorandum which documented the Navy's selected alternative and the cleanup goals for the removal action was signed in July 2010. In addition to the removal action, a fence would be installed on the property line and a berm constructed at the edge of the property line to prevent surface runoff from the abutter's property from flowing onto the Navy property.

D. Galluzzo suggested there should be a sign to let people know the site is there since it is part of the Base-wide Superfund site. D. Barney responded that would be appropriate.

D. Barney continued to describe the removal action. Shaw began the removal action in January 2011 since they couldn't continue working on the WGL cap during the winter. The MGEA was first cleared, erosion controls were put in place, and a chain link fence was installed at the property line. Excavation of the main removal area began in February. Excavated materials were placed in trucks and moved to the stockpile area east of Calnan Road (see Slide 7). Post-excavation confirmatory samples were collected from the floor and sidewalls and the sample results compared to the project clean-up goals. The first confirmatory sample results indicated that five locations required re-excavation due to PAH exceedances. Slide 8 presents the excavation grids, showing the grids with acceptable results which were backfilled (shaded) and the five floor areas requiring further excavation. The first excavation in the soil area was to a depth of 3 feet; the second excavation went an additional foot, to 4 feet. The second excavation began

in March and confirmation samples from the five areas yielded acceptable results. The area was backfilled with clean imported soil in March. The excavated soil (2500 tons) was loaded into covered trucks (Slide 9) and transported to Rochester NH landfill, where it was used for daily cover for their operations.

The excavation of the ditch parallel to Route 18 was performed at the end of March to a depth of 1 to 2 feet below the crushed stone in the ditch. Post-excavation floor and sidewall samples were collected; three sidewall samples had PAH detections requiring re-excavation. These locations were re-excavated in mid-April and the laboratory results are pending.

The next steps (Slide 10) include backfilling the ditch and site restoration activities once the laboratory results indicate the cleanup goals have been met. The Removal Action Completion Report is anticipated in summer 2011 and the Proposed Plan, likely No Further Action, is anticipated in July 2011. The public comment period is planned for mid-July to mid-August and the ROD is scheduled for fall 2011.

M. Parsons asked if the abutter dumped out back in the past. D. Barney responded that in the late 90's, there was a seafood supply company that threw lobster carcasses over the fence.

H. Welch asked where the water went, since the excavated area looked like a pond. D. Barney stated that water in the excavation was not pumped out or actively removed. The excavated saturated soil was moved to the soil management area where the water was allowed to drain out. D. Seitz added that the excavation would fill up with water, but then the water would usually percolate back into the water table, below the bottom of the excavation. There were some rain events, but the water would still eventually drain back out of the excavation down to the water table.

H. Welch asked if there was contamination in the water that was dispersed because the water was not removed. D. Barney stated that the contamination is primarily in the soils, which were excavated and removed generally before the groundwater filled the excavation. The type of contamination at MGEA adheres to the soil and is not easily dissolved into groundwater.

A. Hilbert asked about the contamination in groundwater. D. Barney stated that there was very little contamination in the groundwater, and it didn't warrant any action. In response to a follow up question from D. Galluzzo, D. Barney added that the soil contaminants are not water soluble.

D. Galluzzo asked if the dirt going in the truck is soupy were they certain that there is no leakage from the truck while it is transporting the soil. D. Seitz stated that there really was not a lot of soupy material, and if the material was soupy it would be mixed with dry soils from the excavated material stockpile, so there was no leakage.

D. Galluzzo then asked where the trucks were washed down before going onto public roads. D. Barney stated that the trucks were on clean soil when loaded with the contaminated soils, there was no spillage. In addition after loading, the trucks were covered before leaving the stockpile area. D. Galluzzo responded that he believes there would have been contaminated soil/spillage on the trucks and they should have been cleaned prior to leaving the site. D. Seitz responded that there was no spillage of contaminated soils. There is a turnaround area for the trucks near the stockpile. They drive over large riprap/crushed stone (construction entrance) and anything that would be on the bottom of the trucks will vibrate off as the trucks drive over. The trucks have to drive more than 2 miles to get out to Route 18, including driving through a large puddle. Debris should not be making it out to Route 18. With all the truck traffic leaving the Main Gate site, there were no calls to the Navy about any problems on the public roads.

A question was asked when the final results from the MGEA due in. D. Barney stated they should have the last results by the end of next week.

### **3. UPDATES AND ACTION ITEMS**

D. Barney stated that the monthly RAB update was on the back table.

Action Items: None.

MassDEP Update: None.

IR/EBS Program Site Update: The top three IR sites are Buildings 82 and 81 and the SRA. They are all in different stages of the RI/FS process. When the FS is completed, the preferred remedy for each site will be presented at a public hearing.

D. Barney then showed some slides of recent work on the WGL cap (Attachment D). Work resumed at the WGL late March/early April. A swale was installed around the landfill to collect the rainwater and divert it toward the wetlands. The liner was rolled out in sections (23 ft wide x 710 ft long) and then heat sealed together. There are cut outs made of a section of the weld within every 500 linear foot section to test onsite and then it is sent off site to be checked by a third party lab to confirm that the welds are strong enough. Twenty two weld cuts outs were sent off site for testing. The liner is made of 40 mL thick high density polyethylene. A geocomposite (engineered drainage layer) is placed on top of the liner which creates a layer that water but not sediment can pass through.

M. Parsons asked if the WGL was about 5 acres. D. Barney responded that it is. She then asked what the activity use limitations are for the WGL. D. Barney replied that they include no digging, no disturbance of the cover, etc., similar to the RDA restrictions. There is an access road to facilitate sampling; the cap and the road will be suitable for walking. Signage has been procured that is identical to that at the RDA. The WGL profile is similar to the RDA; it is very gently sloped and not as high in elevation as the Small Landfill.

M. Parsons asked if there's a drainage ditch all the way around the landfill, can anything from underneath leach into the drainage ditch. D. Seitz stated that the ditch is on top of the liner.

M. Parsons asked what the life expectancy of the landfill and liner is. D. Barney stated he was unsure exactly, but hundreds of years.

H. Welch asked if the landfill would be affected if there was a fire on top of the landfill. D. Barney responded that there is 2 feet of soil on top of the liner, so if there was a fire it likely would not impact the liner. The next step at WGL is installing 18 inches of select fill, which is low permeability, clay-like material. After that 8 inches of topsoil will be added and then it will be seeded around June 2011. A. Malewicz added that periodic facility O&M inspections will also be required.

M. Parsons asked if the drainage ditch drained to French Stream. D. Barney said no, the cap is contoured to drain to the wetlands.

M. Bromberg asked if they could take a tour of some of these sites. D. Barney said he would address this at the end of the meeting.

The field work at STP will begin next month to further delineate the extent of impacted soils, before further steps are taken. The RDA and Small Landfill LTM events are ongoing as part of the post-closure process. M. Bromberg asked if there a summer event for the two landfills. D. Barney responded that there is a summer inspection at the Small Landfill, but monitoring occurs in the fall and spring.

M. Bromberg asked if something is more apt to show up during certain seasons. K. Jalkut stated that spring is typically the best time since it is the seasonal high water table. D. Barney added that four quarters of monitoring were completed at the Small Landfill and there was no difference seen between the quarterly results. Ideally monitoring occurs in the spring and fall, which covers the high and low water conditions.

The AOC 55C public hearing is April 25, 2011.

The AFFF (RIA 11) field work will be starting soon to determine the impacts around the Hangar 1 and FFTA.

Comments are being addressed on the IOA SAP.

A data gap field report for RIA 111 has been prepared and next steps will be discussed with the regulatory agencies.

The FOSTs status has not changed, except that FOST 6A is underway and a public comment period may be scheduled for late June/July.

#### Conclusion/Next Meeting

J. Goodrich wrapped up the meeting. The next RAB meeting will be the second Thursday in June (June 9, 2011). It was suggested that in lieu of a formal presentation the RAB will be a tour/walk of some of the sites. The tour could meet at the CSO office and visit WGL, RDA, SRA, etc. Suggested meeting around 6 pm at the CSO, rain or shine.